

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: 28F7DB23AF143F4285257869005490C6

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: "Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS" <Paul.R.Schroeder@usace.army.mil>

Copy To: "Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS" <Earl.Hayter@usace.army.mil>; "Anderson, Mark J Jr NAE" <Mark.J.Anderson.Jr@usace.army.mil>; "Iorio, Maryellen NAE" <Maryellen.Iorio@usace.army.mil>; "Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil>

Delivered Date: 05/11/2010 11:56 AM EDT

Subject: RE: final comments on the NBH CAD cell model report

Paul - the draft write-up on schedule implications looks good. Just a few comments attached.

Thanks for the quick response!

Dave



lhcc.schedule.markup.510.doc

▼ "Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS" ---05/11/2010 10:05:11 AM---Dave, I added a small section at the end of Chapter 4 on the effects of scheduling.

From: "Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS" <Paul.R.Schroeder@usace.army.mil>

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: "Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS" <Earl.Hayter@usace.army.mil>, "Anderson, Mark J Jr NAE" <Mark.J.Anderson.Jr@usace.army.mil>, "Iorio, Maryellen NAE" <Maryellen.Iorio@usace.army.mil>, "Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil>

Date: 05/11/2010 10:05 AM

Subject: RE: final comments on the NBH CAD cell model report

Dave,

I added a small section at the end of Chapter 4 on the effects of scheduling. Any comments on it while we move forward with wrapping this up?

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov>]

Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 1:39 PM

To: Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS

Cc: Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS; Anderson, Mark J Jr NAE; Iorio, Maryellen NAE; Fredette, Thomas ERD

Subject: RE: final comments on the NBH CAD cell model report

Paul - thanks for the info. Just to confirm, go ahead and add a short discussion on the effects of scheduling. But I think we'll keep potential use of AC out of the model report and just continue to consider it as a potential management option/belt and suspenders kind of thing.

Dave

From: "Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS" <Paul.R.Schroeder@usace.army.mil>

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, "Fredette, Thomas ERD" <Thomas.J.Fredette@usace.army.mil>, "Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS" <Earl.Hayter@usace.army.mil>, "Anderson, Mark J Jr NAE" <Mark.J.Anderson.Jr@usace.army.mil>, "Iorio, Maryellen NAE" <Maryellen.Iorio@usace.army.mil>

Date: 05/07/2010 11:55 PM

Subject: RE: final comments on the NBH CAD cell model report

Dave,

I can add a short discussion on effects of scheduling. The gist of the potential effects are described in principle. Since the water in the CAD approaches the sediment pore water quality in about 50 loads, it will do little in terms of the during placement losses. However, it will greatly reduce the losses between placement years. The bigger concern that needs to be addressed is the change in the size of the CAD cell required. With the reduction in placement time, there is a corresponding reduction in the time for consolidation of the dredged material. Therefore, the quantity of consolidation which was about 10 ft prior to capping could be reduced to about 5.5 ft if disposed in one year, increasing the size needed to perhaps

700 ft on a side instead of 650 ft.

Do you want a small section on controls in the main text and conclusions (regarding application of carbon and silt curtains)? I believe that we had deleted the content on activated carbon because we did not present it in the main body of the text. Use of activated carbon in this manner is somewhat experimental. The only application of this nature has been the broadcasting of PAC in a CDF to control volatilization. GAC could also be used and it will settle faster with less loss of AC from the CAD cell, but with potentially less stripping of PCBs from the water column within the CAD cell. The settled AC would serve to also strip the PCBs from the pore water being expelled from the settled dredged material. Other delivery systems such as Sedimite could deliver AC to the dredged material surface in the CAD cell but it would not provide any control for the existing contamination in the water column after placement.

Silt curtains with activated carbon could provide controls on PCB losses during placement.

The need for controls is probably questionable considering how small the loss is likely to be in comparison to the losses that are likely to be occurring at the dredging site.

Paul

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [<mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov>]

Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 10:24 AM

To: Schroeder, Paul R ERDC-EL-MS; Fredette, Thomas ERD; Hayter, Earl ERDC-CHL-MS; Anderson, Mark J Jr NAE; Iorio, Maryellen NAE

Subject: final comments on the NBH CAD cell model report

Hello - thanks to all involved with this effort. Looks to me like we have a very good product. My relatively few and minor comments are attached in blue text.

My one over-arching comment (repeated in the attachment) is this: the modeling assumes placement over three years, yet our cost estimates are now assuming only one or two years (depending on funding) to fill the cell. Can the report add a short discussion about but what the likely

impact would be (i.e., higher or lower losses) if the cell is filled over a shorter time frame - i.e., one or two years?

Thanks again - Dave

p.s. - I'll look over the tables and figures early next week and get any comments on those to you as well)

(See attached file: lhcc.erd.c.model.rep.finalreview.doc)

[attachment "Lower Harbor CAD Report May 2010prs.doc" deleted by Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US]